

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VI, Issue No. VII

A Monthly Newsletter

January, 2001

Firearms in America: The Facts

By Martin L. Fackler, MD

I must confess to being a member of a very dangerous group. I am a physician: We cause more than 100,000 deaths per year in the USA by mistakes and various degrees of carelessness in treating our patients. Why does society tolerate us?

Because we save far more patients than we kill. Firearms are entirely analogous. Although used in far fewer deaths* - they are used to prevent about 75 crimes for each death. Firearms, like physicians, prevent far more deaths than they cause. (Gary Kleck, *Point Blank: Guns and Violence in America*, Hawthorne, N.Y., Aldine de Gruyter Publisher, 1991)

Consider the implications of the fact that firearms save many more lives than they take. That means decreasing the number of firearms would actually cause an increase in violent crime and deaths from firearms.

This inverse relationship between the number of firearms in the hands of the public and the amount of violent crime has, in fact, been proven beyond any reasonable doubt. (John R. Lott Jr., *More Guns Less Crime*, University of Chicago Press, 1998)

History supports the inverse firearm-crime relationship. In *Firearms Control - A Study of Armed Crime and Firearms Control in England and Wales* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972, p. 243), Chief Inspector Colin Greenwood found that:

No matter how one approaches the figures, one is forced to the rather startling conclusion that the use of firearms in crime was very much less when there were no controls of any sort. Half a century of strict controls on pistols has ended, perversely, with a far greater use of this class of weapons in crime than ever before.

In Tasmania, Australia, on 28 April 1996, a lone gunman killed 35 and wounded 21 at the Port Arthur Historic Site. The Australian legislature reacted by outlawing self-loading rifles and pump as well as self-loading shotguns. One year after the massive confiscation of guns the

effects of this action became clear. Every category of violent crime had increased; the most striking was a 300 percent increase in assaults against the elderly.

Those demented persons who have expressed their frustration by a shooting spree have apparently retained enough good sense to choose places where those shot would almost certainly be unarmed: a schoolyard in Stockton, Calif., the Columbine High School, a Jewish day care center in Los Angeles, a Long Island Rail Road car (due to the highly restrictive ban on handgun carry permits in New York).

The emotional reaction to these incidents, attempting to make certain places "gun free" zones, for example, revealed a striking lack of rational thought. Apparently those pushing for "gun free" zones failed to recognize that the perpetrators of these incidents chose their sites specifically because they were already essentially "gun free" areas - practically guaranteeing no armed resistance to foil their plans.

Such gun-restrictive proposals are a certain recipe for making the situation worse. Lott's studies have shown that such mass shootings essentially disappear in states that pass laws allowing qualified citizens to carry concealed handguns (*The American Enterprise*, July-August, 1998).

Consider the steadily decreasing rate of violent crime over the past eight years. An article in *USA Today* (K. Johnson, 9 Oct 00, 3A) reported "Gun injuries in crimes fall 40% in 5 years." This stark decline has occurred concomitantly with a constant rise in the number of firearms in the hands of the American public.

This strongly supports the "more guns less crime" relationship verified by Kleck, Lott, history, and common sense. This steady decrease has brought the current percentage of gun violence in the USA to its lowest rate in the past three to four decades. One would expect the anti-gun groups to be pleased and to moderate their goals.

Instead, apparently rankled by the facts proving their theories dead wrong, they are promoting increasingly prohibitive gun laws with ever-increasing zeal. Could it be that the media attention bestowed upon their cause has become addictive? Certainly, legislators have found the free TV time given to their anti-gun tirades something they cannot live without.

I suggest that a reason for the decreasing crime rate, caused in part by the increasing number of guns, lies, perversely and ironically, in the counterproductive exaggerations and incessant

repetitions, by the TV media, of each and every bloody shooting they can find.

This has frightened and misled the public into believing the threat from guns is ever increasing, rather than decreasing sharply, and has whetted their appetites for firearms to defend themselves. Thus the public has bought more firearms - which has further decreased the violence from firearms. There is a perception among gun owners that they are being treated irrationally as legislators pander to the misinformed majority who are being swayed by emotional appeals that fly in the face of the studies cited above, history, and basic common sense. They feel that legislators should be obliged to soberly consider the facts and not have their votes dictated by blind, unthinking, and most often counterproductive, emotion.

Consider firearm registration: being increasingly promoted by nearly all anti-gun groups - and politicians. These promoters neglect to explain why or how they expect firearm registration to prevent future violence; especially since, historically, such restrictive laws have always proven ineffective or counterproductive - most often causing a marked increase in violent crime, as shown in the examples given above. We already know how honest, formerly law-abiding, citizens will react to irrational laws requiring them to register their firearms.

California has taught us. After Purdy's shooting spree on the Stockton schoolyard in 1989, the Californian legislature passed a law requiring the registration of all "assault rifles." In the emotional frenzy following that shooting incident, everybody expected legislators to pass such a restrictive law.

What happened? The price of "assault rifles" tripled in California. Many tens of thousands of these rifles poured into California before the law went into effect. Then came the time for registration. Very few "assault rifle" owners chose to obey the law.

It is uncertain how many criminals were created by this irrational law, but most estimate that fewer than 10 percent of the "assault rifles" in California were registered. If an estimated several hundred thousand "assault rifle" owners in California chose to become criminals rather than obey an

irrational law, how many gun owners nationwide can we expect to do the same if required to register their guns?

Most of the facts explained above are unknown to the majority of the American public. The pro-gun political activists spend so much time harping on the Second Amendment that they tend to overlook the factual proof that decreasing the number of guns increases violence, and vice-versa.

Additionally, I believe that most Americans consider their right to protect themselves and their families a far more fundamental right than the Second Amendment.

Many honest gun owners are now frightened. They have every reason to be. Few of the facts outlined above have been revealed by a media that, instead, gives full play to the emotionally based appeals and flagrant exaggerations of the anti-gun groups.

These gun owners fear that they will be forced into a difficult moral decision: Do they obey a law requiring them to register their firearms, when they are fully aware of the irrationality and counterproductive nature of such a law? Or are they morally obligated to disobey such an unjust law - and thus become a criminal? Our forefathers faced a similar moral dilemma. Had most of them chosen to obey, we would still be a colony of England.

We must separate, dispassionately, the clearly established facts about firearms in the USA from emotionally based opinions, exaggerations, and falsehoods. No rational approach to any problem is possible until this is done.

I worry that irrational restrictive measures, such as mandated gun registration, will result in a massive backlash of civil disobedience - not by drug-dazed teenagers, but by sober, honest, and mature adults who are well-armed and proficient in the use of their weapons. That could tear this country apart.

*Footnote. When anti-gun activists list the number of deaths per year from firearms, they neglect to mention that 60 percent of the 30,000 figure they often use are suicides. They also fail to mention that at least three-quarters of the 12,000 homicides are criminals killing other criminals in disputes over illicit drugs, or police shooting criminals engaged in felonies. Subtracting those, we are left with no more than 3,000 deaths that I think most would consider truly lamentable.

--Dr. Martin Fackler is a forensic expert on ballistic injuries.

What is Democracy?

Democracy is the pernicious doctrine that three wolves and a sheep should take a majority vote on what's for supper.

What is a Constitutional Republic? In a constitutional republic, the wolves are expressly forbidden to vote on what's for supper, and the sheep are well armed.

And on that note we have some

DEFINITIONS

1. Democracy: Three wolves and a sheep voting on dinner.
2. Republic: The flock gets to vote for which wolves vote on dinner.
3. Constitutional Republic: Voting on dinner is expressly forbidden, and the sheep are armed.
4. Federal Government: The means by which the sheep will be fooled into voting for a Democracy.
5. Freedom: Hungry wolves looking for dinner and finding well-informed and well-armed sheep

An Open Letter to President-Elect George W. Bush

Dear President-Elect Bush:

Congratulations on surviving a vote count that at times must have felt like the Night of the Living Gore. We wish you, and the country, well.

However, we believe it's vital to remind you of some very important matters you need to take care of -- the sooner the better! To help you set priorities, we're offering you this partial list.

1. Under our First Amendment right to petition for redress of grievances, we ask you to remove the barricades and re-open the streets around the White House. (If the socialist president of Chile can do it, so can you.) This will demonstrate your trust of the citizens -- and may help to remind everyone that the president of the U.S. is an administrator "hired" by the people and the states, not a pampered potentate or an autocrat wallled up in the Kremlin.

2. Since our friends assure us you are pro Second Amendment, we know you'll be glad to press for the immediate repeal of the Brady Law, the five-day "instant" gun registration scheme and the "assault weapons" ban. That'll be a good start on getting rid of every, single infringement. And before the repeals go through? Order your executive agencies to stop enforcing all those unconstitutional gun laws.

3. Stop all federal civil asset forfeitures NOW. Return all assets seized from the innocent or seized from *anyone* without due process. (If the asset isn't available any more, make the officers and court officials who took it make restitution out of their own pockets -- since they were violating the Fourth Amendment "under color of law" when they did it.)

4. Immediately halt all federal participation in or regulatory encouragement of highway "checkpoints" -- whether for "seat belt compliance," alien smuggling, drinking, pollution, insurance ("Your papers, citizen!") or whatever other harebrained thing police imagine they can arbitrarily subject us to. Since when does any administration imagine Americans will put up with *that* sort of thing for very long?

5. Do you remember the Fifth Amendment protection against double jeopardy? How about putting an immediate stop to the practice of bringing federal prosecutions against people who've already been tried for the same act at the state level? Just because your guys give the charge a

different name, Mr. Bush, doesn't mean they've fooled us. We know double jeopardy when we see it.

6. And don't you think the Sixth Amendment makes it pretty clear that we won't put up with sealed warrants, secret informants, bribed informants or people being held in "detention" for years without trial?

7. While we're on the subject of trials, how about making it G.W. Bush Justice Department policy to seek to have fully informed juries in all federal criminal cases?

8. Amendment Eight. Cruel and unusual punishment. Now there's one we *know* you'll sympathize with, Mr. Bush. As a former party-hearty boy (and c'mon we know you tried a little of everything), we're confident you'll be glad to issue an immediate pardon to the 500,000 or so people serving long prison sentences for non-violent drug offenses. Enough already! Let them go back to their children, partners, jobs and homes. (Those homes you're going to give *back* to them after those illegal seizures.)

9. And regarding those other rights retained by the people, as the Ninth Amendment so clearly reminds us. There's a lot you could do, but we'll suggest two good starters. First, recognize our right to privacy by signing a law that says the Social Security number is *never* to be used for anything but Social Security accounting. Then -- because, Mr. Bush, the federal government just doesn't have the authority to force innocent people to "comply" with anything -- make Social Security participation voluntary.

10. Order executive agencies to stop bribing the states into giving up their powers. It's nuts to expect the states to sell their citizens' rights, privacy and freedom for federal handouts -- with money that was actually earned by those poor citizens in the first place!

That about covers the Bill of Rights. For the moment, anyway. We'll have more BoR enforcement suggestions later. But for now, we'll close with two related ideas:

First, tell Congress to quit delegating its legislative powers to your executive branch agencies (like the EPA, the ATF and the IRS). C'mon Dubya, you *know* Congress has no constitutional authority to do that! And it's taking us to the point that every bureaucrat thinks he's our Grand Poobah Dictator. Order your executive agencies to stop enforcing unconstitutional regulations immediately. And if Congress doesn't get the message, then veto every bill in which they try to weasel out of their full legislative responsibility.

Second, vigorously prosecute every officer, bureaucrat, prosecutor or prison guard who violates a citizen's civil rights "under color of law." You've got two

powerful tools for doing that -- the Fourteenth Amendment and the Anti-Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871, which forbids exactly that sort of governmental hooliganism. How about starting with Lon Horiuchi? And the butchers of Waco?

And then please, when both the federal and state governments have gotten the message that *they* have limits and *people* have rights -- go back to your quiet little job of governing under the provisions of the Constitution.

Thank you,
Concerned Citizen Opposed to Police States, <http://www.ccops.org>

And Speaking of Police States...

Cops 'n More Cops

Recently, here in New Jersey, 11 cops, WITHOUT a warrant, burst into a motel room and loosed 27 shots at a naked man armed with a sinister, assault, semi auto TV remote control. The shootee died of a bullet wound to the heart. The incident is being "investigated" by the local prosecutor, but this being NJ, we don't hold out much hope that these punk cops will ever see the bar of justice.

--Gun Owners of New Jersey

* * *

Memos Point To FBI Murder Coverup

By EDMUND H. MAHONY

BOSTON - Senior FBI agents have had credible information for nearly 40 years that a gangster they were recruiting as an informant planned a notorious local murder, but agents hid the evidence and allowed four apparently innocent men to be convicted of the crime, newly released documents show.

Of the four men, two died of old age in prison, a third had his sentence commuted after serving about 30 years and the fourth remains imprisoned.

The new disclosures about the 1965 murder of local hoodlum "Teddy" Deegan are the most recent made by a special federal task force conducting a sensational investigation into whether organized crime investigators in Boston committed crimes ranging from obstruction of justice to murder.

The task force investigation, now in its third year, has focused principally on the relationship between FBI agents and two infamous informants - James "Whitey" Bulger and Stephen "The Rifleman" Flemmi, leaders of the city's Winter Hill Gang.

Evidence presented in court accuses Bulger and Flemmi of committing at least 21 murders, many of them while working for the FBI. A federal judge, in a related proceeding, has concluded that FBI mob investigators routinely broke the

bureau's own rules governing the use of informants.

Deegan was gunned down in a Chelsea, Mass., alley while Boston was rocked by mob warfare. At the time, the FBI was under enormous public pressure to shut down organized crime.

The new revelations about the men who may have been wrongly convicted in the Deegan case are contained in 26 pages of previously secret FBI memos disclosed to defense lawyers. Distribution lists made when the memos were generated suggest that senior bureau officers - including the late Director J. Edgar Hoover - knew that another bureau informant and at least one senior agent believed that innocent men may have been wrongly convicted.

"[The FBI] is an organization that we the people are supposed to be protected by," said attorney Victor Garo, who represents Joseph Salvati, one of the four men. "And they are breaking the law whenever they want. This cover-up started in 1965 and it continues into the year 2000. When does it end?"

An FBI spokeswoman in Boston declined to comment.

At the time, one of the bureau's most effective tools was the development of confidential informants - men who had to be criminals themselves to be effective.

The newly released memos show that on March 9, 1965 - three days before Deegan died - the FBI's Boston Division targeted Vincent James Flemmi as an informant. Flemmi is described in the memos as an unpredictable killer who aspired to be the city's top "hitman".

Both Vincent Flemmi and his brother Stephen Flemmi were recruited by two legendary FBI mob investigators - H. Paul Rico and Dennis Condon. Rico and Condon, both retired, are subjects of the special task force investigation. Among other things, the task force is curious about how some of their informants seem to have escaped prosecution for a variety of crimes.

The memos, which have been censored, show that the FBI had learned from other informants that Flemmi was trying to arrange Deegan's murder as early as October 1964 - five months before his death.

Within hours of Deegan's killing, detectives with the Chelsea Police Department obtained information independently of an FBI informant that Flemmi and four other men participated in the murder.

However, the case was closed on the basis of sworn testimony of still another informant recruited by Rico and Condon - Martin Barboza. Based on his testimony four apparently innocent mobsters were convicted.

Task force investigators would not say what, if anything, they plan to do with the memos, which were recently discovered in Washington. Garo said he is consulting with Joseph Salvati on how to proceed. Salvati was released from prison when former Gov. William Weld commuted his sentence. The imprisoned Peter Limone's lawyer could not be reached to discuss the case.

In a June 4, 1965, memo to Hoover evaluating Flemmi's fitness as a possible FBI informant, the head of the FBI's Boston Division wrote that the agent handling Flemmi "believes" that Flemmi murdered Deegan and "from all

indications, he is going to continue to commit murder."

-- *Hartford Courant*, December 21, 2000

Diesel Therapy, Part II

Some time ago we printed an account by former U.S. House member George Hansen, who, as a federal prisoner, experienced some unpleasant cross country excursions, which prisoners at that time wryly referred to as "diesel therapy." Apparently things haven't changed much. - Ed.

WOULD LIKE VERY MUCH TO SEND TO ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE A WRITTEN COPY OF WHAT HAPPEN TO ME WHILE BEING TRANSPORTED BY A PRIVATE COMPANY CALLED "TRANSCOR".

TRANSCOR IS A COMPANY THAT TAKES PRISONERS FROM ONE STATE TO ANOTHER. THEY ARE A PRIVATE COMPANY OWNED BY "CCA" THAT IS TAKING THE PLACE OF U.S. MARSHALS AND LOCAL AND STATE POLICE.

BECAUSE OF THIS LITTLE TRIP I TOOK I AM NOW LEGALLY BLIND (20/400) BOTH EYES. THAT IS WHY THIS IS IN ALL CAPS. I AM IN FRONT OF A LARGE SCREEN TV. I HAVE A DISC (C-5 & 6) IN MY NECK DAMAGED, THAT CANNOT BE FIXED. I HAVE PTSS, PINS AND NEEDLES, SEIZURES, HEADACHES, BALANCE PROBLEMS, AND MUCH MORE. I AM HOME BOUND.

I HAVE A LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT IN VERMONT: BROWN vs. TRANSCOR, et al., DOCKET NO. 1:99 cv 181 AGAINST THIS COMPANY BUT I DO NOT THINK IT IS GOING WELL FOR I CANNOT FIGHT THEIR BIG TIME LAWYERS. THEY HAVE TWO MANY LAWYERS AND ARE JUST WEARING MY LAWYERS OUT. MY GOAL IS TO DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO STOP THESE COMPANIES. NOT ONLY WERE THINGS DONE TO ME BUT I SAW AND HEARD OF THINGS DONE TO OTHER PRISONERS -MALE AND FEMALE.

THESE "PRISONS ON WHEELS" ARE WORST THAN THE CATTLE TRUCKS THAT CARRY CATTLE TO THE SLAUGHTER. IF YOU WERE IN THE VAN YOU WOULD BE CUFFED AND CHAINED FOR DAYS WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO SIT UP STRAIGHT OR EVEN STAND. THERE IS NO MEDICAL ATTENTION AND LITTLE FOOD. I WAS GIVEN NO MORE THAN 3 OZ. OF WATER A DAY. THIS IS SO THAT THE GUARDS DO NOT HAVE TO LET YOU OUT OF THE VAN TO USE THE RESTROOM. IF YOU HAVE TO GO YOU GO ON YOURSELF.

I WENT 10 DAYS WITHOUT A BATH, ALL THE TIME I HAD CLEAN

CLOTHES IN THE VAN TO PUT ON. WHEN I WAS GOING THRU TEXAS ONE OF THE WOMEN STARTED HER PERIOD. SHE HAD NOT HAD A BATH I KNOW FOR 5 DAYS, THE GUARDS GAVE HERE A ROLL OF TOILET TISSUE AND SAID THAT ALL YOU GET. I WAS WITH HER FOR 1 MORE DAY AND SHE WAS TRANSFER TO ANOTHER VAN.

"TRANSCOR" HAS A POLICY THAT THEY INFORM YOU ABOUT WHEN THEY PICK YOU UP AND ALL DURING YOUR TRIP WITH THEM IT STATES: THE MORE YOU COMPLAIN OR THE MORE YOU ASK FOR ANYTHING AS WATER OR FOOD OR THE TIME OF DAY--THEN THE LESS YOU GET AS FOOD AND WATER.

THEN THEY INFORM YOU OF A RIGHT THAT THEY SAY THAT THEY HAVE: THAT ONCE THEY GET YOU THEY CAN KEEP YOU HID ON THE ROAD FOR UP TO 180 DAYS. THAT'S WITHOUT CONTACT WITH FAMILY OR LAWYERS. THEY HAVE 180 DAYS TO GET YOU WHERE YOU ARE GOING. THEY WILL JUST KEEP YOU MOVING FROM THE EAST COAST TO THE WEST COAST AND BACK AGAIN, UNTIL THEY ARE READY TO DELIVER YOU TO YOUR DESTINATION.

IN THE VAN, I WAS CUFFED AT MY HANDS WITH A CHAIN AROUND MY WAIST, THEN A CHAIN TO MY FEET WHICH WERE CUFFED (THEY CALLED IT SHORT CHAINED) THEN CHAINED TO OTHER PRISONERS. I COULD NOT EVEN REACH MY HANDS TO MY FACE TO EAT, SO I HAD TO BEND DOWN TO MY WAIST.

AT ONE TIME I WAS IN THE BACK OF A VAN CHAINED DOWN TO 10 OTHER MEN, NOW IT IS ONLY ABOUT A 4 FT. HOME MADE BENCH OVER EACH TIRE WALL AND THE CAGE WAS NOT MUCH LONGER. IN FRONT OF US WAS ANOTHER CAGE WHERE 4 WOMEN WERE. THE VAN HAD NO AIR OF ANY KIND, ONE DAY IT GOT SO HOT WE ALL PASSED OUT. THERE IS A LOT TO TELL IF YOU WANT TO KNOW.

THE HELP...I NEED IS FOR EVERYONE TO TALK TO OTHERS AND FIND ME PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN ON A TRANSCOR TRANSPORT. I NEED THEIR STORIES. THEY CAN WRITE ME. THEY CAN EVEN CALL IF THEY FEEL THAT IT IS THE SAFE WAY.

ALSO CONTACT
FRANK GREEN AT THE THE
RICHMOND TIMES
fgreen@timesdispatch.com
ALAN PRENDERGRAST AT
WESTWORD
alan.prendergast@westword.com

ERIC BATES AT MOTHER JONES MAG.
bates@motherjones.com
SENATOR LEAHY OF VERMONT
senator_leahy@leahy.senate.gov

TELL THEM YOU WANT THIS STORY TOLD. TELL THEM YOU WANT TRANSCOR AND ONES LIKE THEM STOPPED. IF YOU KNOW OF ANY OTHER REPORTERS LET THEM KNOW AND LET ME KNOW WHO THEY ARE. PLEASE...

PHILLIP C. 'OTIS BROWN
P. O. BOX 94
LONDONDERRY VT. 05148
802.--379--0036
THANKS THANKS THANKS

Former Cop Says Police Will Ignore Constitution and Confiscate Firearms

* * *

Job Comes First

The following letter was sent to Concerned Citizens Opposed to Police States. -- Ed.

Dear Sirs:

I must agree with the letter [CCOPS] posted by Peter Mancus and, his interviews with police officers regarding gun confiscation.

First of all, let me "qualify" myself. I am a former police officer and have been very close to the law enforcement community as a somewhat "famous" gun writer. I have authored numerous articles on self-defense, with and without arms. I'm also the author of the book: SWAT BATTLE TACTICS. So, I feel I'm somewhat qualified to speak on police and gun control matters.

Mr. Mancus is correct in his assertion (sic) that a great majority of police officers will, in fact, obey an unlawful order to disarm law-abiding citizens. I have heard the argument too many times in police circles to believe otherwise.

The comment(s) most often heard are: "If I'm ordered to disarm civilians, I'll do it. I've got my job to think about." And, another comment is: "Most people don't 'need' guns." I don't know what qualifies a police officer to determine my "need" of a firearm. It's my God-given "right" to own a means of self-protection.

I've trained a lot of police officers in the use of firearms and in SWAT methods. And, to be honest with you, most police officers don't "need" a gun. They are not properly trained in the use of firearms and more importantly, citizens "Rights" under the Constitution. Did you ever watch the TV program "Cops" on Saturday nights? You see those police officers violate citizens Rights at every turn. It's more the "norm" than the exception!

Why am I no longer a police officer? Because I received too many "orders" (which I refused to follow) to violate citizens'

Constitutional Rights! No job, no matter how "important" it may seem, is worth it.

Sincerely,
P. C., December 13, 2000

"Proof that most local cops are not anti-gun"

The following was forwarded by Gun Owners Alliance of Texas. Readers can decide for themselves who is right, CCOPS or LEPSA. -- Ed.

Gun Owners Alliance is pleased to present proof of our claims that most "local" cops are NOT anti-gun, and would NOT obey orders to confiscate firearms from law-abiding citizens.

Here is "The R E S T of the Story" that KABA [Keep and Bear Arms], CCOPS and JPFO [Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership] do not want you to read. We are appreciative of Executive Vice President, Tom Aveni, of LEPSA (Law Enforcement for the Preservation of the Second Amendment), and his tremendous efforts to dispel the outright lies against "local" police officers. Below, we bring you a letter from Mr. Aveni over this crucial issue.

Gun Owners Alliance
Chris W. Stark - Director

Dear Sirs,

There has been an alarming volume of Internet-based communication regarding allegations that all or most policemen are predisposed to obeying any orders that might eventually be given to disarm the law-abiding public. This correspondence is intended to address this absurd yet alarming trend.

As a past and present police officer, with a life-long commitment to preserving the Second Amendment, and having started a pro-gun police organization in possible detriment to my career advancement, I'd like to share some thoughts with you.

Every survey taken of police officers thus far, without exception, has been overwhelmingly pro-gun. In addition, most LEO's are not as robotic as many believe, and they routinely question official policy and procedures that seem unsafe, unnecessary, or unlawful.

To suggest that most police will blindly acquiesce in any order to confiscate firearms from the law abiding masses is absurd and without any factual foundation. Would some officers obey such orders? Of course, but presumably most would be on either the state or Federal level, whereby they would lack any bond with the local populace they would be expected to disarm.

If you fear firearms confiscation, actively oppose the trend to Federalize local law enforcement, or even place city agencies

under Justice Department supervision. Should the butchers of Waco really be entrusted with overseeing local agencies anyway? The usurpation of local authority is a process that is often invisible. It is a process empowered and accelerated by Federal grant money dangled before local agencies with numerous preconditions.

Everyone associated with the preservation of the Second Amendment should be mindful of the fact that our opponents would love nothing more than to splinter our forces, and radicalize our image. Having presumably pro-gun organizations participate in bashing all or most policemen is so transparently detrimental to our cause that it should be seen for what it is: the work of people who wish to divide and demonize us in the eyes of the general public.

Anyone wishing to see the surveys taken of police sentiments regarding gun control can do so at our website <http://www.lepsa.org> or they may go directly to our collection of police surveys by going to:

http://www.lepsa.org/police_oppose%20gun%20control.htm

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Aveni

Executive Vice President

Law Enforcement for the Preservation of the Second Amendment (LEPSA)

<http://www.lepsa.org>

(603) 363-4809

The Ten Commandments of Propaganda

1. Divide and conquer. Possibly the oldest political tactic known to man. As long as the people are busy fighting each other, they will never know their real enemy. Hate speech is valuable to this end.

2. Tell the people what they want. Not to be confused with telling them what they want to hear, you are telling them what they want, and why they cannot live without it.

3. The bigger the lie, the more people will believe it. Coined by Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi "Reichminister for propaganda and national enlightenment," this truth has been proven time and time again, especially in times of war.

4. Always appeal to the lowest common denominator. Abraham Lincoln said "you can't fool all of the people, all of the time". But, if you can fool enough of the people, enough of the time, you can get away with anything. The trick is to find the common hopes and fears of the largest majority.

5. Generalize as much as possible. Specifics are not very important. Most people would prefer to think in the simplest terms possible--black and white, good and evil, Communist and Capitalist, etc.

6. Use "expert" testimony. A degree and screen presence is pretty much all you need to be an authority on anything in the modern world. People like celebrities.

7. Always refer to the "authority" of office. Once your authority is established, you need to periodically remind the people of it. It will add credibility to your purpose.

8. Stack the cards with "information". Statistics and facts work wonderfully, especially when the average person only partially understands them, and when conflicting data is censored.

9. A confused people are easily led. When a person hears the truth, he won't know it, because it will be lumped together with dis-information, half-truths, and lies.

10. Get the "plain folks" onto the "bandwagon". Make John Doe your propaganda agent. Middle Americans will "relate" to him, and so will their friends, and their friends, and their friends.

....And remember: when all else fails, use FEAR.

ROSELAND, NEW JERSEY, ENJOINED FROM ENFORCING "WEAPON-FREE ZONES"

On November 20, 2000, Judge F. Michael Caruso of the Superior Court of NJ Essex County issued a final judgment permanently enjoining the Borough of Roseland from enforcing Ordinances 11-2000 and 25-2000, "Weapons Free Zone." The Association of NJ Rifle and Pistol Clubs successfully stopped Roseland from enacting a law that would have prevented the ownership and transport of firearms within certain radiuses of schools and public areas.

CONSPIRACY THEORIES IN MONTCLAIR, NEW JERSEY!?

In November, the *Montclair Times* printed another attack letter on the ANJRPC lawsuit by Jessica G. de Knonick, a former Town Council member and advocate of Ceasefire NJ. The ANJRPC and some Montclair residents had sued the Board of Education for sending home a Million Mom/Ceasefire NJ flyer, but refusing to send home a Moms for Gun Safety flyer, thus abridging our First Amendment rights.

De Knonick is incredulous that gun owners might be upset that a Ceasefire flyer was sent home--simply an oversight, she claims. She then spins an absurd conspiracy theory. that the NRA is "targeting" Montclair because "we try to protect our children" (unlike other communities!) The not so subtle insinuation is that gun owners do not protect or care about our children--what arrogance, what utter nonsense! (The NRA, by the way, is not a plaintiff, nor has it provided any financial, legal or other support to the lawsuit.)

De Knonick then "concludes" that the NRA picked Montclair because it is honoring Senator Frank Lautenberg a "tireless advocate for gun control." Does she really think that anyone cares about honoring a retiring Senator?

Here's the real deal: Our Montclair lawsuit is a First Amendment case. It is not a Second Amendment case. And that is why liberals like de Knonick are reduced to making up

ridiculous conspiracy theories. If they were honest, they would simply oppose the First Amendment issues that our lawsuit raises.

Well it is about time these people learn they can't step on toes and not get kicked!! Ed.

Interesting election statistics

Population of counties won by Gore: 127 million

Population of counties won by Bush: 143 million

Square miles of country won by Gore: 580,000

Square miles of country won by Bush: 2,427,000

States won by Gore: 19

States won by Bush: 29

Average Murder per 100,000 residents in counties won by Gore: 13.2

Average Murder per 100,000 residents in counties won by Bush: 2.1

-- Professor Joseph Olson, Hamline University School of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota 55104-1235

jolson@gw.hamline.edu

Gun Fires 180 Rounds per Minute

An Australian inventor has come up with a gun that can fire 180 rounds in one hundredth of a second, or an impossible 1 million rounds a minute - so fast that a bullet enters the barrel before the preceding one has even left the muzzle.

Incredibly, storekeeper James Michael O'Dwyer's gun has no moving parts and operates entirely on electrical impulses.

Despite the fact that O'Dwyer's invention has vast and even dizzying implications as an awesome military weapon, when he approached Australian defense officials in 1994 with his idea they turned a deaf ear. And when he showed his gun to former U.S. Special Forces chief Gen. Wayne Downing, the general said O'Dwyer was "certifiably" crazy.

That was then. The general is now a member of the board of directors of Metal Storm Ltd., O'Dwyer's new company, along with retired U.S. Adm. William A. Owens.

As described in the Nov. 13 issue of *Forbes* magazine, in the barrel of the gun "bullets are stacked like Life Savers with explosive charges sandwiched in between."

The charges are set off when electrical contacts spark them in "precisely timed electronic sequence," much the same way an ink jet printer sprays ink.

O'Dwyer's company now has a \$10 million contract to design a .50 caliber sniper's rifle that could fire three rounds before the rifle even recoiled, spoiling the sniper's aim. In Australia the military is working on a 40 mm grenade launcher.

According to *Forbes*, in a recent test a 36-barrel gun fired bullets at a rate of a mind-boggling 1 million rounds a minute. Among the weapons O'Dwyer's idea could

produce would be super-rapid-fire multiple barreled guns that would emit a "cloud of hot metal" instead of a stream of bullets and capable of downing cruise missiles and modern versions of Kamikaze suicide planes.

O'Dwyer's super gun has already created a cloud of hot money - though his company hasn't produced a single sale, his stock is now worth \$180 million, and he owns half the shares.

OOOH I want one of these!!! -- Ed.

Why Common Thieves Are Better Than Socialists

Thieves have the guts to do the job themselves.

Thieves don't steal in the name of "justice".

Thieves don't masquerade as "liberals".

Thieves don't comprise a unified political mob of millions.

Thieves don't loathe freedom and individuality.

Thieves don't undermine the Constitution.

Thieves don't promote mind control via "political correctness" and "hate" crimes

Thieves don't own or control the "establishment" media.

Thieves don't indoctrinate our children to be unquestioning drones of the state.

Thieves can be arrested.

--M. G.

And now a note to Dear Abby

Dear Abby,

I am a sailor in the US Coast Guard. My parents live in a suburb of Camden and one of my sisters, who lives in Paterson, is married to a transvestite.

My father and mother have recently been arrested for selling marijuana and are currently dependent on my other two sisters, who are prostitutes in Jersey City.

I have two brothers, one who is currently serving a non-parole life sentence in Trenton State Prison for rape and murder of a teenage boy. The other

brother is currently being held in the Union County jail on charges of incest with his three children.

I have recently become engaged to a former Thai prostitute who lives in Atlantic City and indeed is still a part-time "working girl". However her time there is limited, as we hope to open our own brothel with her as the working manager. I am hoping my two sisters would be interested in joining our team. Although I would prefer them not to prostitute themselves, at least it would get them off the street, and hopefully the heroin...

Abby, my problem is this: I love my fiancé and look forward to bringing her into the family and of course I want to be totally honest with her....

Should I tell her about my cousin who voted for Gore?

Signed, Worried About My Reputation

Camden County Lawsuit Suffers from "Fatal Defect"

CAMDEN, N.J. - A federal judge dropped 11 of 21 gun makers from a lawsuit filed against the industry by a New Jersey county, saying the manufacturers cannot be held responsible for the actions of gun users. Camden County is seeking restitution for the costs of handgun violence and wants to force the industry to improve gun safety. But U.S. District Judge Jerome B. Simandle said the case suffers from a "fatal defect."

More than 30 U.S. cities and counties have sued the industry, with mixed results. Last year a state judge allowed Atlanta's lawsuit to proceed. But an Illinois judge dismissed Chicago's case in September.

In its lawsuit, filed in 1999, Camden County said gun makers allowed weapons to fall into criminals' hands because of lax distribution policies and irresponsible marketing. Thirty people were killed by handguns in Camden County in 1998. Eleven of the manufacturers asked for case to be dismissed. They included Beretta U.S.A. Corp., Colt's Manufacturing Co., Glock GmbH and Glock Inc., Smith & Wesson and Sturm, Ruger & Co. Ten manufacturers remain as defendants.

--<http://www.nandotimes.com> December 8, 2000

* * * *

The Editorial staff of the NJ Militia Newsletter, wishes our honest readers a Happy and Prosperous New Year!! Keep your powder dry!!!

Ban a Gun - Go to Jail

By L. Neil Smith

The Constitution, without qualification, states that the individual right to own and carry weapons will not be infringed. Title 18, U.S. Code, Sections 241 and 242, ordains as a crime the violation of anybody's civil rights. Part of the XIV Amendment requires removal of any politician who defies the Constitution, barring him (or her) from public office in perpetuity. And, of course, betraying one's oath of office is perjury, which is a felony.

By attempting to ban semiautomatic weapons (or weapons of any sort), city authorities in Dayton, Ohio and Rochester, New York have broken all these laws. It's possible that conspiracy and racketeering statutes apply to their illicit activities, as well.

We all know how slight the chances are that any of these miscreants will be prosecuted for having violated our natural, fundamental, inalienable human, civil, and Constitutional rights under the current political circumstances. However as students of history, we also know that political circumstances change -- a fact they seem to have overlooked.

If they can't be prosecuted now, why not a year from now? If not a year from now, why not four years from now? And if not four years from now, why not twenty? Simon Wiesenthal never gave up on the Nazis. Why should we -- who feel that the Bill of Rights is all that keeps America from becoming the world's biggest banana republic -- ever give up on the Dayton or Rochester perpetrators, or on any public servant who introduces, sponsors, or votes for gun control?

Von Clausewitz, the eminent Prussian strategist, said you should always give the enemy a way out, so he won't fight like a trapped animal, and be likelier to retreat. So what can these criminals in Dayton and Rochester do to avoid weeks, months, and possibly years of looking over their shoulders, waiting for the long arm of the highest law of the land to punish them?

Three things: they must repeal the offending legislation; they must resign from office immediately afterward; and they must promise, publicly and in writing, never to seek or hold public office again.

N.J.M. P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

militia264@aol.com

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art.....(732) 607-0833

Wake County, NC, Dave..... (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill(973) 361-3241

**Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00
Cash or Blank Money Order Only**

Name _____

Address _____

City.....State..... Zip.....

Phone ()..... Email.....